

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
August 17, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dennis Cope and Lee Madrid

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer and Gary Lee, Senior Planners

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Vice Chairperson of the Design Review Board Dennis Cope at 7:25 PM.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE060039, Redmond Transit Parking Garage**

**Description:** Three-level parking garage consisting of 108,000 s.f., one ground level, two elevated levels containing approximately 380 parking stalls. Designed to the draft downtown district design standards and 2003 IBC

**Location:** NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street and 161<sup>st</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Gerrie Jackson

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee / 425-556-2418

Gary Lee presented the staff report for this first pre-application meeting for the Downtown Park and Ride Garage. Staff is concerned about the stark nature of the side elevations, light trespass through the screening and from the rooftop parking deck to the nearby residential properties, and the lack of an articulated top along the sides of the structure. Staff would like for the applicant to describe the light fixtures and how they screen the light and to add more modulation to the tops of the building along the side. The project provides for approximately 380 parking stalls in a two-level parking structure.

Greg Harry with KPG, architectural consultants for this project, 753 9<sup>th</sup> Ave North, Seattle, WA 98109, explained that there would be a six-story Transportation Oriented Development (TOD) on the western portion of the site. As part of the TOD, there is a 30-foot-wide pedestrian path that is dedicated for perpetuity. This garage facility would be on the eastern portion next to an existing heavily treed, evergreen area. The southern side has another heavily treed area. According to the Redmond Zoning Code, this building needs to back onto the back of the sidewalk and is not required to have side or rear setbacks. However, in designing the facility, they elected to preserve a 44-foot wide buffer on the eastern side of the building and approximately a 15-foot buffer on the southern portion of the building. This should be an understated facility backdrop for the streetscape of the transit center. He showed the material boards for the Redmond Transit Center, noting that the project will include the use of brick and other high-quality materials that will relate to the materials of the transit center and to the NE 83<sup>rd</sup> Street corridor. There is a safety concern about directing pedestrians at safe locations across the streets at crosswalks, so the elevator and the entrance to the building will be in the northeast corner, directly adjacent to the crosswalk. There is a wayfinding purpose to the elevator tower. In adjacent areas are an existing office building and a senior housing facility. The facility will have an emergency generator with a masonry enclosure and having acoustical housing that will go on the upper level of the garage. From a security standpoint, it is very important that the access points to the garage be limited. The framework that will house the grill will break up into a storefront-like modulation. The other issue is to design the building as open as possible and that is why the elevators are glass fronted. The landscaping and other concealed areas close to the building are avoided. There will be ground cover only near the building, and they will take advantage of the buffer of the site for the taller landscaping. The street lighting will be

the lighting. The pedestrian path will be comprehensively designed by the developer of the TOD. They will be providing building-mounted lighting on the east side of the building that has the 44-foot setback. Regarding the issue of light escaping from within the building, there will be light shielding on the fixtures at the perimeter of the building, so that light should not escape from the building. The applicant will bring a sample of this at the next review.

Sheldon Teel, project manager for King County Metro, 11911 E Marginal Way S, Tukwila, WA 98168, spoke about the lighting of the rooftop areas. Historically, they try to raise and lower the lighting depending on the situation during hours of operation. They go to lower light levels if the surrounding uses require that. With heavy tree cover, they will tend to provide more lighting for pedestrian and user safety. If the area is more open and exposed, they will lower the lights. They recently did this in Issaquah where they had varying conditions of light need.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

##### MR. MADRID: (\* see below)

- Confirmed that the parking structure in Issaquah is not the same, but the lighting fixtures will be identical.
- Agreed with staff that the east and west elevations are plain, particularly since that is eventually going to be a major pedestrian throughway, even though not visible from the streetscape side. The stark nature of the concrete columns does not seem to give a pleasant pedestrian experience. He would like to see something done with those sides; maybe some color—some creative way of making that pop. Since it is not on the streetscape side but on the pedestrian alley, this needs something more handsome. For continuity, the other side should be treated equally to the pedestrian side. Some artwork would be nice on the pedestrian side, but the deck should have a similar feel, although not necessarily artwork.
- Thought the north elevation is nice, but the elevator enclosure could have more pop, particularly if for wayfinding. Maybe on the top area make an articulation or modulation with materials, particularly since this is the only pedestrian entrance.
- Appreciated the elevations shown that have landscaping in front.
- Confirmed that all but three trees will be removed, although the applicant's objective is to retain as many trees as possible.
- Commented that the lighting plan is very important to the Design Review Board.
- Inquired about what lights would be on the roof. The lighting and its encroachment would be very important to him, especially wayfinding lighting at the north entrance or for the parking deck. (The applicant explained that for the next review they would bring photos of the Issaquah facility that has the same lighting.)
- Confirmed that they would intensify lighting where needed for safety—but add shielding to the lighting.
- Noted about the north façade being mainly lighting by utilizing street lighting, but confirmed that there would be additional wayfinding lighting there.
- Agreed with most of staff's issues or recommendations.

##### MR. COPE: (\*see below)

- Noted that the landscape plan shows that the large majority of those trees would be removed.
- Commented that the rendering was obviously done to show what the applicant wanted the Design Review Board members to see. He would prefer a much more honest rendering when they show a rendering. That elevation most in question by staff is the most prominent elevation and is the one being covered up by the other building and a tree, so the rendering is more manipulative than helpful. (The applicant explained that they thought it better to show a truer representation since there would be a six-story building 30 feet away.)
- Inquired about what determined the width of the 30-foot pedestrian path. (Mr. Lee explained that the path is part of the mid-block pedestrian system, which is always 30 feet according to the Development Guide and does not exist now, but was created because of this project. The TOD will develop this when they develop their project.
- Confirmed that the colors and materials for the transit center will be similar to the parking facility.

- Appreciated the applicant bringing in all the materials.
- Thought the building would be stronger if there were a cap on the top floor.
- Would like to make sure that the area designated for news vending on the north elevation is adequate, thought out, and designed.
- Echoed Mr. Madrid on the side elevations—they are much too bleak. Why not use a green screen? That would be an inexpensive way to sustain that elevation next to the pedestrian plaza.
- Noted that on the landscape plan the two drawings need to coordinate.

**\*As directed by Mr. Cope and Mr. Lee the following statement has been added. Taken in the context that both board members did not have complete knowledge of the proposal and their comments were less relevant without that knowledge. Mr. Madrid's comments do not apply at all in terms of the parking deck or the site plan in general. All of Mr. Cope's comments regarding the Redmond Transit Parking Garage were withdrawn.**

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **PRE060040, KFC Exterior Modifications**

**Description:** Remove existing mansard roof, cupola, and exterior signage; replace with new exterior stucco walls, parapets, and new signage.

**Location:** 7970 159<sup>th</sup> PI NE

**Applicant:** Byron A. Balogh

**Staff Contact:** Steve Fischer / 425-556-2432

Steven Fischer presented the staff report on the proposed exterior modifications to the KFC. No change is proposed for the existing parking lot or landscaping at this time, but staff would investigate nonconformities in those areas during the land use entitlement process. KFC is also proposing some modification to signage, which was not included in the packet. KFC's new corporate design calls for stucco facade accented with aluminum sunshades and awnings with an LED light band under the cornice.

Byron Balogh, Balogh Architecture, 12379 SW Canvasback Way, Beaverton, OR 97007, gave an overview, explaining the technique as removing the existing skin on the building and replacing with a new skin. There is no physical change to the footprint or the site plan. They would remove the existing mansard and the trusswork that supports the mansard but leave the framing on the face of the building. The existing height of the parapet would continue as the new parapet height. The building is currently CMU block with a stucco finish. They would also remove the false pilasters projecting out of the walls. They would be framing up a new tower for a location for the street front identity sign. There will be another tower on the entry door side that will be punched out 15 inches to give some mass. He brought some 3-D renderings of the proposed redesign and signage. He brought the details for an LED light fixture. He added that he was onsite earlier that evening and saw how bad the parking lot is now, and needing a maintenance resurfacing and new curbs.

#### **COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:**

##### **MR. MADRID:**

- Appreciated KFC updating the look.
- Assumed correctly that the color palette was not finalized yet.
- Liked the cornice structure and the aluminum sunshades.
- Thought this to be a nice upgrade to KFC.
- Would be concerned about the lighting—not a big fan of neon; would be very hesitant to say that he would like to see neon as it appears to look here. He confirmed this is a corporate decision. Thought the lights on the other side of the building were a little plain. Not sure how he would go with the neon issue; if there could be compromises, he would like to see other lighting to downplay the neon.
- Liked the building in general. The scale from a pedestrian standpoint and the tower identifying the building are quite nice.
- Liked the new look—just concerned about those particular lighting issues.

Mr. Balogh requested direction on the signage, so Mr. Fischer gave him the contact information for Carl McCarthy, the code enforcement officer for signage.

MR. COPE:

- Confirmed that the scale of the building is pretty much staying the same.
- Requested that the applicant include freshening up the trash enclosure in the remodel. Anything done to the building should be mimicked with the trash enclosure.
- Suggested that they do something about the side of the building on the drive-thru side.
- Was fine with LED, but noted there is hesitancy from the DRB members to go with LED, corporate policy or not.
- Suggested bringing photos of another installation the next time.
- Noted the advantage of LED vs. neon—could control the wattage of LED.
- Did not care for the stucco; the detail of the tile would be a richer look.
- Thought that the sunshades did not really shade the building at all. (The applicant confirmed that the sunshades project out 15 inches and are part of the diner look.)
- Agreed with Mr. Madrid about the lighting.
- Assumed they would see the front door elevation at next review.
- Liked the look of the base and reveals.

Staff confirmed with the applicant that the mechanical equipment would be hidden by the parapet on the roof, and noted that the height of the parapet screening the height of the mechanical equipment is a big issue here.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 PM. MOTION CARRIED (2-0).**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**